

**Meeting Minutes  
Travis Air Force Base  
Environmental Management  
Building 246, Downstairs Conference Room  
Installation Restoration Program  
Remedial Program Managers Meeting**

**14 February 2001, 0930 hours**

Mr. Allen Brickeen, Travis Air Force Base (AFB), conducted the Remedial Program Managers (RPM) meeting held on 14 February 2001 at 0930 in Building 246, Downstairs Conference Room, Travis AFB, California. Attendees included:

- Allen Brickeen                      Travis AFB
- Mark Sandy                        Travis AFB
- Glenn Anderson                Travis AFB
- Dale Malsberger                Travis AFB
- Wilford Day                      Travis AFB
- Major DeAnn Lehigh            Travis AFB
- Anne D'Lima                    Travis Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Member
- Roger Johnson                 Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence (AFCEE)
- Parker Atkins                    Informatics
- Elizabeth Allen                 Tech Law
- Jose Salcedo                    Department of Toxic Substances Control
- Sarah Raker                     San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Daryl Greenway                CH2M HILL
- Leslie Royer                    CH2M HILL
- Chuck Elliott                   CH2M HILL
- Scott Eckman                   CH2M HILL
- Deena Stanley                  URS/Radian International
- Mike Wray                      GTI/IT

Handouts distributed throughout the meeting included:

- Attachment 1 Meeting Agenda
- Attachment 2 Master Meeting, Teleconference, and Document Schedule
- Attachment 3 SBBGWTP Monthly Data Sheet, January 2001
- Attachment 4 South Base Boundary Groundwater Treatment Plant, Dioxin Sampling Results (Table 1 and Table 2)
- Attachment 5 CGWTP Monthly Data Sheet, November 2000
- Attachment 6 NGWTP Monthly Data Sheet, December 2000
- Attachment 7 GSAP Calendar Year 2001 Slide Presentation
- Attachment 8 Proposed Sampling for March 2001 GSAP Event (Table 1); Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Program 2000 Data Summary
- Attachment 9 LTO Strategic Plan Slide Presentation; Travis Long Term Operation (LTO) Strategic Plan: Contents — Draft 8 February 2001
- Attachment 10 State Water Resources Control Board Memorandum, Subject: Effect of SWANCC v. United States on the 401 Certification Program
- Attachment 11 CH2M HILL Field Activities, February 2001 – March 2001
- Attachment 12 URS Field Activities (January 2001/February 2001)
- Attachment 13 GTI Field Activities (February/March 2001)

## **1. ADMINISTRATIVE**

Mr. Allen Brickeen (Travis AFB) introduced Mr. Roger Johnson, who has replaced 1<sup>st</sup> Lt. Sierra Suhajda of AFCEE, and Major DeAnn Lehigh, who will replace Kevin Neurer.

### **A. Previous Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Brickeen — The 10 January 2001 meeting minutes went final with minor corrections.

### **B. Four-Month Calendar of Upcoming Milestones and Meeting Dates**

The revised Travis AFB Master Meeting, Teleconference, and Document Schedule was distributed (see Attachment 2).

### **Annual Meeting and Teleconference Schedule**

- The Monthly RPM meeting for May 2001 has been changed to 16 May 2001 and Supplier meeting was changed to 15 May 2001.
- Mr. Anderson proposed, and it was agreed, that the May RPM teleconference be changed to 30 May 2001.
- The July RAB meeting was changed to 26 July 2001, and the October RAB meeting was changed to 25 October 2001.

### **Master Meeting and Document Schedule**

- Page 2, the North Groundwater Treatment Plant Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Manual, Revision 1 and Central Groundwater Treatment Plant O&M Manual, Revision 1, schedule was established.
- Page 3, the Natural Attenuation Assessment Work Plan (NAAW) Technical Memorandum for FT004/SD031 schedule was revised to reflect the actual date of submission of the predraft to the Air Force.
- Page 4, the Basewide Soil Remedial Design/Remedial Action (RD/RA) Plan for Remedial Action/Correction Action Management Unit (CAMU) and SD042 Soil Remedial Design (RD) schedules were revised allowing additional time to focus on higher priority issues.
- Page 5, the Cypress Lakes Removal Action Report and DP039 Treatability Study Report schedules were established.
- Page 6, the Quarterly Newsletter schedule was updated.
- Page 6, the Community Relations Plan schedule was changed to reflect the actual submission date.
- Page 7, the Long-Term Operation (LTO) Strategic Plan and Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Program (GSAP) 2000 Data Report schedules were established.

## **2. OPERABLE UNIT UPDATE**

### **A. North/East/West/ Industrial Operable Unit**

#### **1. Landfill Cap Design**

Mr. Malsberger stated that comments have been received on the Draft LF007 Soil Remedial Design Report from U.S. EPA. Ms. Raker stated that the Water Board landfill group was reviewing the document and she would provide comments by 28 February 2001. Mr. Salcedo stated that he has reviewed U.S. EPA's comment and does not have any additional comments.

Mr. Malsberger stated that there are some U.S. EPA comments that need clarification. He will get clarification from Mr. Lucey via email and send copies to the other agencies.

A key issue in the Design of the Corrective Action Management Unit (CAMU) at LF007 is use of an evapotranspiration (ET) cap versus a prescriptive cap. Mr. Malsberger asked if the agencies were in agreement with an ET cap for the CAMU. Ms. Raker stated that she is reluctant to give an opinion because her agency considers the ET cap to be quite innovative. Currently, there are no ET caps in San Francisco Bay Region 2; therefore, the Water Board is being careful in addressing this topic. Ms. Raker stated that Mr. Brad Job gave the opinion that although Travis AFB has good justification for an ET cap, there is no guarantee that it will be approved. However, the justification should be well documented.

Ms. Raker commented that the Potrero Hills Landfill is conducting an ET cap pilot study.

Mr. Malsberger requested that an ongoing dialog of concerns continue in order to stay abreast of, and answer any questions that may arise prior to comments being submitted. Travis offered to meet with agency personnel reviewing the design if that would clarify design issues and expedite the review/approval process.

#### **2. CAMU Acceptance Level Technical Memorandum**

Mr. Malsberger stated that he submitted to the agencies via e-mail the preliminary response to the agency comments on the CAMU Acceptance Level Technical Memorandum. Ms. Raker stated that she has reviewed the preliminary responses and that they look good. Mr. Malsberger will contact Mr. Lucey to determine if he has reviewed the preliminary responses to comments.

### **3. Soil RD/RA Plan**

Mr. Malsberger stated that this document was extended for two months in order to focus on higher priority issues.

### **4. Vernal Pools**

Mr. Malsberger stated that a meeting was held with Carmen Thomas of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on 7 February 2001. U.S. EPA also attended. The landfill cap design and ecological survey were discussed. Travis AFB also gave a tour of the landfill.

USFWS is considering issuance of a letter of “not likely to adversely affect” (NLAA) within two weeks depending on results of their internal review of the design issues. The USFWS representative requested information on how Travis AFB will protect the vernal pool on the north base boundary during the project construction.

Mr. Anderson commented that he conducted a tour of Landfill X with Mr. Lucey, the Travis AFB community planner, and a representative of Civil Engineering, which proved to be helpful in discussing the existing institutional controls. (This may be an ongoing discussion, since the U.S. EPA looks at the institutional controls as an interim remedy.)

Mr. Salcedo asked if the issue is about building a berm around the area. Mr. Anderson elaborated that the controversy is based on U.S. EPA’s perception that the selected alternative is interim. The remedy is what the Air Force desires because it fits with the existing land use restrictions and is appropriate for the protection of existing vernal pools adjacent to the site.

Mr. Salcedo stated that it is his understanding the problem was the future land use language in the record of decision (ROD). Mr. Anderson stated that this language was requested by U.S. EPA; and if this is the holdup, it can be deleted.

Mr. Salcedo stated that he will discuss this with Mr. Lucey.

## **B. West/Annexes/Basewide Operable Unit**

### **1. Groundwater Protection Technical Memorandum**

Mr. Anderson stated that he submitted the document via email to the agencies with changes based on Mr. Lucey’s comments. Mr. Anderson and Mr. Lucey will meet next week to discuss approval of the changes.

Mr. Anderson will work with Water Board staff to make sure that their comments are addressed.

Ms. Raker asked, if the changes are implemented, will the Groundwater Protection Technical Memorandum be finalized. Mr. Anderson stated no. The memorandum identifies the selected remedial alternatives for the WABOU soil sites. Mr. Lucey has stated that the memorandum will not be finalized until the Landfill X issue is resolved.

## **2. Ecological Approach**

Mr. Anderson stated that there has been a delay on the ecological work due to contracting delays. The contract may be in place early in April 2001.

A draft of the ecological approach may be issued to the agencies in May 2001, because the internal review will take longer than usual.

## **3. CURRENT PROJECTS**

### **A. Treatment Plant Performance Monitoring Recommendations**

Mr. Sandy stated that he is waiting for the “no comment” letters from Mr. Salcedo and Mr. Lucey.

### **B. South Base Boundary Treatment Plant**

Mr. Mark Sandy reported that the South Base Boundary Groundwater Treatment Plant (SBBGTP) performed at 86% uptime with approximately 5.5 million gallons of groundwater extracted and treated during the month of January 2001. The average flow was 157 gallons per minute (gpm). Approximately 3.1 pounds of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were removed during November 2000. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 130 pounds. (See Attachment 3.)

The SBBGTP is currently down for upgrade of the control system and will be in operation later this week. The FT005 on-base wells will startup this week.

Mr. Sandy stated that three material safety data sheets (MSDSs) for sequestering agents were submitted to Ms. Raker. Mr. Sandy stated that the Water Board has previously allowed the use of one of the three sequestering agents, which has not started yet. Ms. Raker stated that she has drafted a letter on this.

Ms. Raker asked if the discharge will be checked for foaming and algae growth because of the phosphate content of the agents. Mr. Sandy stated yes. Mr. Sandy went on to say that the creek will be monitored at least weekly.

Mr. Sandy said that there was no word yet on finalizing the easement for access to the off-base portion of FT005.

## **1. Dioxin in Union Creek**

Mr. Malsberger distributed a handout that summarized the dioxin sampling results (see Attachment 4). These tables summarize all the dioxin samples collected in the effluent and the creek over the last three years.

Mr. Malsberger stated the TCDD 2378 results were consistently non-detect and are below the discharge limits stated in the NEWIOU Groundwater Interim Record of Decision (IROD). (The values were in picograms per liter.) Every hit is qualified, which means the detection is right at the limit of the analytical technology.

Mr. Malsberger stated that there does not appear to be an effluent problem. The dioxin levels in the creek are very low and will be addressed in the NEWIOU ROD for soil, sediment, and surface water. Mr. Malsberger stated that although dioxin is not listed as a contaminant of concern (COC) in the remedial investigation data, the RPMs will determine if a cleanup level for dioxin is necessary in the ROD.

Mr. Brickeen commented that a study conducted at Aerojet determined that dioxins in their creek originated from field burning.

Ms. Raker suggested that the Air Force draft a technical memorandum identifying the source of the dioxin stating the problem with dioxin and how it will be addressed; the memorandum can be used to supplement the remedial investigation and to put the issue to rest. Mr. Brickeen stated that there is not enough information available to do this.

Ms. Raker asked for clarification of the field duplicate footnote that states, "The field duplicated precision exceeds the expected sampling and analytical precision . Lack of analyte reproducibility may be due to noise interference commonly experienced at low detection levels." Mr. Malsberger stated a field duplicate was collected and dioxin was identified below the detection limit; however, it could not be quantified.

Ms. Elizabeth Allen commented that although the values are above detection limits, they are below quantitation limits. The "J" flag means an educated guess has been made and that the limit of this technology has been reached.

Ms. Raker stated that her chemist will review the data and provide comments. At the March RPM meeting, she will report if the RWQCB considers the levels detected in Union Creek to be significant and if any further investigation or action is warranted.

Mr. Parker Atkins asked if the Water Board has a database on dioxin sampling. Ms. Raker stated that the Water Board is reviewing this issue very closely along with the discharges. She will investigate if a database exists.

Ms. Raker commented that when reporting data, qualify the level of accuracy of the data.

**C. Central Groundwater Treatment Plant**

Mr. Sandy reported that the Central Groundwater Treatment Plant (CGWTP) performed at 96% uptime during January, with approximately 3.5 million gallons of groundwater treated. Approximately 1.8 million gallons of water were extracted and treated from SS016 during the reporting period. The West Treatment Transfer Plant (WTTP) and associated wellfields extracted approximately 1.7 million gallons. The average flow for the CGWTP was 81 gpm for the month. Approximately 26 pounds of VOCs were treated during January 2001. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 937 pounds (see Attachment 5).

Mr. Sandy stated that DP039 startup took place on 13 February 2001. Ms. Raker stated that she has reviewed the DP039 O&M manual, which was fine.

LF008 startup is planned for the near future.

**D. North Groundwater Treatment Plant**

Mr. Sandy reported that the North Groundwater Treatment Plant (NGWTP) performed at 80% uptime. From 1 January to 31 January 2001, approximately 5.3 pounds of VOCs were removed. Approximately 0.9 million gallons of water were extracted and treated. The average flow for the NGWTP was 29.4 gpm for the month of January. The total mass of VOCs removed since startup of the system is 54 pounds (see Attachment 6).

Mr. Sandy reported the piping modification was accomplished to separate the air stream through the air stripper from the SVE air stream through the carbon. The startup letter was submitted to and reviewed by Ms. Raker.

Mr. Sandy stated that the draft O&M manual would be submitted to the agencies on 15 March 2001

Mr. Brickeen asked Ms. Raker if she has received a response to the notice of violation (NOV). She stated that she has not received a hardcopy of the letter. Mr. Brickeen asked if the letter is adequate to clear the NOV. Ms. Raker stated the Water Board will need to review the letter.

Ms. Raker asked if the NGWTP is treating more water for trichloroethene (TCE) than the SBBGWTP and CGWTP. Mr. Sandy stated that the



concentration coming from the SBBGTWP is approximately 100 parts per billion (ppb) and from the CGWTP it is 700 – 1,000 ppb. The concentrations at the NGWTP are at approximately 600 ppb.

Ms. Raker asked about the inflow to the WTTP, what is the relative amount of VOCs from the SVE versus the groundwater. Mr. Sandy stated that he will investigate and report at the next RPM meeting.

Mr. Mike Wray commented that one of the goals for the NGWTP is to increase the well yield with the SVE system, not to extract soil vapor from the vadose zone.

**E. ST032 Evaluation of Remedies**

Mr. Sandy stated that he received Mr. Lucey's comments on the ST032 evaluation of remedies and will prepare the responses.

**F. Golf Course Removal Action**

Mr. Anderson stated that the field activities are complete, the fence was reinstalled, and the area is hydroseeded. The removal action report schedule has been established.

Once the document is complete, the achieved goals will be recorded in the ROD.

**G. Groundwater Sampling Analysis Program**

Mr. Chuck Elliott gave a presentation on the Groundwater Sampling Analysis Program (GSAP) (see Attachments 7 and 8).

The strategic plan will chart the course Travis AFB will follow and will include optimizing the monitoring program and monitoring approaches.

**Sampling Schedule**

The new sampling schedule will focus on interim remedial actions. The current program is in transition to a less frequent sampling schedule. The new program will focus on multiple site groupings and rely on decision rules, resulting in one large annual sampling event, a semi annual event of medium size, and small quarterly events.

Mr. Elliott proposed having the large sampling event in May when the water table is at the highest, access to the wells is easy, and weather is good. Medium size sampling events would take place in November, when the water table is at its lowest and may provide seasonal variation. Small sampling events would be in August and February.

### **Document Schedule**

The proposed change in the reporting schedule is for a draft annual report in September, followed by the final report in November. This would allow time to review the data before the November semi-annual sampling event. The report will cover a full year up to and including the annual sampling event in May. Separate, smaller reports will be produced for semi-annual and quarterly events.

### **2001 Schedule**

Although the last quarterly event was in December, Mr. Elliott proposed conducting another quarterly event in March. Then in May 2001, conduct the annual sampling event and discuss how the annual sampling event will be conducted with a presentation in April 2001. A draft annual report will be submitted in September 2001, which will include the 2000 data and data from the 2001 annual event.

2001 data summary would include the groundwater contour maps, TCE time-series plots at interim remedial action (IRA) sites, summary of chemicals detected in 2000, and wells scheduled for the March quarterly sampling event. It will also include the wells proposed to be sampled in March 2001.

Mr. Elliott reviewed the GSAP 2000 Data Summary (see Attachment 8).

Mr. Elliott requested agency feedback concerning the proposed changes. Ms. Raker asked if the natural attenuation sites will be incorporated into the monitoring. Mr. Elliott stated no.

Ms. Raker asked for clarification of the sampling at monitoring wells versus extraction wells. Mr. Elliott stated that GSAP focuses on the monitoring wells.

Ms. Raker commented that the proposed schedule is a good idea. She also requested that the data be provided in a useable format via a CD-ROM.

## **4. PROGRAM ISSUES UPDATE**

### **A. LTO Strategic Plan Objectives**

Mr. Brickeen presented the Long-Term Operations (LTO) Strategic Plan objectives, the outline, and the schedule (see Attachment 9).

One of the purposes of the LTO Strategic Plan is to look at ways to reduce the LTO costs. Mr. Brickeen requested the agencies to review the Strategic Plan objectives and outline and submit comments.

Mr. Brickeen proposed having a Strategic Planning meeting on 2 May 2001.

**B. Clean Water Act Supreme Court Ruling**

Ms. Raker distributed a memo concerning the Clean Water Act (CWA) Supreme Court ruling (see Attachment 10). The conclusion states, "The thrust of the Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County (SWANCC) decision is that regulation of inland, isolated waters is and should be under the primary authority of the state rather than the federal government." Although the U.S. Air Force does not acknowledge the State of California laws, the Water Board will continue to ask the Air Force to follow the Porter Cologne Act as closely as possible until this has been resolved. (See Attachment 10.)

Mr. Salcedo stated that his agency's legal department has not given an interpretation of this decision at this time.

**C. DSMOA**

The DSMOA will need to be signed by the end of February 2001.

**D. Other**

Mr. Brickeen distributed the field activity reports from CH2M HILL, URS, and GTI (see Attachments 11, 12, and 13).

**ACTION ITEM LIST**  
**(Action Item Closed)**

AGENDA	RESPONSIBLE	ACTION ITEM	DUE DATE	
1.	Air Force	To talk to the Civil Engineering operations concerning Landfill X use.	Open	The future land use will be training area. Completed.
2.	U.S. EPA	To provide comments on the ST032 technical memorandum.	Open	Completed. <b>Item Closed</b>

**ACTION ITEM LIST**  
**(Action Item Opened)**

AGENDA	RESPONSIBLE	ACTION ITEM	DUE DATE	
1.	DTSC	To submit “no comment” letters on the Treatment Plant Performance Monitoring Recommendations, WIOU NAAW, CAMU soil acceptance level technical memorandum, groundwater protection technical memorandum, ST032 technical memorandum.	1/11/01	Mr. Salcedo stated that he signed letters in the mail
2.	RWQCB	To review the Travis AFB dioxin data to determine what further action is necessary.	3/14/01	New Item
3.	RWQCB	To follow up on the letter from Air Force in response to the notice of violation.	Open	New Item